

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,817	HEIN, BARBARA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sarah Purol	3634	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Sarah Purol.

(3) _____.

 (2) Kristofer Halvorson.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 January 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: First office action was returned to PTO as undeliverable. Examiner telephoned applicant's attorney to see what the status was on his end and whether the address on file at PTO was correct. Applicant's attorney verified the address on file with PTO. Why the first action was returned as undeliverable is unknown. Nevertheless; attorney stated that this application is abandoned. This communication is attached to a Notice of Abandonment.